

REMARKS

In the June 23, 2004 Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-28 as anticipated by US Patent No. 6,469,718 issued to Setogawa that describes in detail the data structure for creating menus for the user. On July 16, 2004, the Applicant responded to the Examiner's Final Office Action. The Examiner, in turn, rendered the Instant Advisory Action to which the Applicant is replying.

In the Advisory Action, the Examiner maintained the rejection of claims 1 - 28 by specifically citing various portions of Setogawa. In particular,

"Setogawa's Fig. 13 is a DVD player configuration where the data from DVD 101 is inputted into the system by 103, and that a DVD is a video that has a plurality of presentations, and that MPEG video decoder 115, MPEG audio decoder 116, and subpicture decoder 114 are included to aid the decoding and permitting the display of these presentations of a video." (EMPHASIS ADDED)

Therefore, it would appear that in order to support the 35U.S.C. 102 rejection of claims 1 - 28, the Examiner equates "a subpicture" as a presentation of a video. With all due respect, the Applicant believes that the Examiner has misinterpreted "subpicture" since the term "subpicture" is clearly and unequivocally defined by Setogawa as a still image that is separate and distinct from a video.

"In the DVD format (standard), the format of still picture called subpicture that may be overlaid on a moving picture is defined besides normal moving pictures coded in MPEG" at column 1, lines 20 - 23.

The definition of "subpicture" as a still image separate and distinct from a video is reiterated at column 4, lines 51 - 55 as well as a number of other locations in Setogawa. In this way, Setogawa unequivocally defines a subpicture as a still image and not as described by the Examiner as a video.

In contrast, the invention as recited in claim 1 requires,

"A method of displaying a video, said method comprising:  
receiving a datastream comprising information for a plurality of presentations of said video;

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

displaying a first presentation of a segment from said video in normal playback on a display;

displaying at least a portion of a second presentation of said segment from said video on said display while displaying said first presentation; and

permitting a user to select a desired presentation for displaying on said display."

Therefore, in contrast to the display of a still image (i.e., subpicture) over a video as described by Setogawa, the invention recited in claim 1 specifically teaches a method for the concurrent display of a first and second video presentation that affords a user the ability to select one video presentation or the other for playback on the display.

In this way, a DVD player configured in accordance with the invention affords a user the ability to concurrently display both the first and the second video presentations (or segments thereof). This is further illustrated in FIG. 5 of the application where a first presentation is displayed in portion 504 and a second presentation is displayed concurrently in a portion 508. The Applicant believes that claim 1 as presented is not anticipated nor suggested by the cited reference and is therefore allowable.

Claims 10 through 28 are also allowable for essentially the same reasons as discussed above.


SEP. 23. 2004 2:20PM 16509618301

NO. 579 P. 12

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims are allowable. Should the Examiner believe that a further telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,  
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP

  
Michael J. Ferrazano  
Reg. No. 44,105

P.O. Box 778  
Berkeley, CA 94704-0778  
(650) 961-8300

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning  
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

## **BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES**

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☐ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER:** \_\_\_\_\_

**IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.**

**As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.**